



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,630	06/30/2003	Jeffrey A. Aaron	60027.5047US01/BLS 02049	1405
7590 Jodi L. Hartman Hope Baldauff Hartman, LLC 1720 Peachtree Street, N.W., Suite 1010 Atlanta, GA 30309			EXAMINER CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/28/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/611,630	Applicant(s) AARON, JEFFREY A.	
	Examiner Mellissa M. Chojnacki	Art Unit 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on October 30, 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 9-15, 18-22 and 24-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 9-15, 18-22 and 24-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/2007; 2/2008; 5/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on October 30, 2007, claims 4-6, 8, 16-17, 23, and 34-35 are cancelled; claims 1, 13-14, 18, and 24 have been amended, and no new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-3, 7, 9-15, 18-22, and 24-33 are still presently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 12-17, 22-28 and 32-34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Burnett (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087408).

As to claims 1, Burnett teaches a method for providing automatically facilitated marketing and provision of electronic services (See abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0036-0043), comprising:

searching a database for a match between user input and information in the database (See paragraph 0015; paragraph 0029; paragraph 0087);

obtaining keyword from the information in the database (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019);

determine at least one offered service associated with the at least one keyword, the at least one offered service associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one offered service and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one offered service (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019; paragraphs 0352-0353; paragraph 0364);

determine a weighted value associated with the at least one offered service based on the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0162; paragraphs 0352-0353; paragraph 0364), and

prioritize the at least one offered service based on the determined weighted value customer (See abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0035; paragraph 0039; paragraphs 0042-0043; paragraph 0052).

As to claim 2 and 14, Burnett teaches wherein determining at least one offered service associated with the at least one keyword further comprises: determining at least one generic service related to the at least one keyword (See paragraphs 0036-0039); and determining the at least one offered service based on the at least one generic service (See Burnett, paragraphs 0015-0019; paragraph 0094; paragraph 0264; paragraph 00353; paragraph 0364).

As to claims 3, 15 and 33, Burnett teaches if the at least one offered service includes a bundle of two or more services, then determining a weighted value associated with the at least one offered service based on a technical weighting and a preference weighting associated with each of the two or more services of the bundle of service (See Burnett, paragraph 00353; paragraph 0364).

As to claims 12 and 22, Burnett, teaches outputting the at least one offered service and information associated with the at least one offered service to a user's processing device (See Burnett, paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 0364).

As to claim 13, Burnett teaches a computer-readable medium (See abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0036-0043) comprising:

searching a database for a match between user input and information in the database (See paragraph 0015; paragraph 0029; paragraph 0087);

logic configured to obtain at least one keyword from the information in the database (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019);

logic configured to determine at least one offered service associated with the at least one keyword, the at least one offered service associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one offered

service and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one offered service (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019);

logic configured to determine a weighted value associated with the at least one offered service based on the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting (See paragraphs 0352-0353); and

logic configured to prioritize the at least one offered service based on the determined weighted value (See abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0035; paragraph 0039; paragraphs 0042-0043; paragraph 0052).

As to claim 24, Burnett teaches a system for automatically facilitated marketing and provision of electronic security services (See Burnett, abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0036-0043), comprising:

a service suggestion analyzer operatively coupled to the cycler, the service (See Burnett, abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0035; paragraph 0039; paragraphs 0042-0043; paragraph 0052).

determine at least one offered service associated with the at least one keyword, the at least one offered service associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one offered service and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one offered service (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019; paragraphs 0352-0353; paragraph 0364);

determine a weighted value associated with the at least one offered service based on the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0162; paragraphs 0352-0353; paragraph 0364), and

prioritize the at least one offered service based on the determined weighted value customer (See abstract; paragraphs 0001-0002; paragraph 0035; paragraph 0039; paragraphs 0042-0043; paragraph 0052).

As to claim 25, Burnett as modified, teaches wherein the service suggestion analyzer further comprises an analyzer module, a service module and an output module (See Burnett, paragraph 0036-0043).

As to claim 26, Burnett as modified, teaches wherein the service suggestion analyzer comprises a psychological assistant module and a special deals interface module configured to provide special sales on time sensitive offers (See Burnett, paragraphs 0211; paragraphs 252-253; paragraph 266; paragraphs 277-278; paragraph 369; paragraph 412-413).

As to claim 27, Burnett as modified, teaches wherein the service suggestion analyzer is further configured to: determining at least one offered service associated with the at least one keyword further comprises: determining at least one generic service related to the at least one keyword (See paragraphs 0036-0039); and determining the at least one offered service based

on the at least one generic service (See Burnett, paragraphs 0015-0019; paragraph 0094; paragraph 0264; paragraph 00353; paragraph 0364).

As to claim 28, Burnett as modified, teaches wherein the analyzer module is further configured to include a lookup table to provide the clustered needs list (See Burnett, paragraph 0173; paragraph 0176; paragraph 0183; paragraph 0186; paragraph 0188; paragraph 0194).

As to claim 32, Burnett as modified, teaches wherein the output module is operatively coupled to the service module and the output module is further configured to provide at least one offered service to a user via at least one of a user's display device of a processing device, auditory means including synthesized voice or paging device (See Burnett, paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 00353; paragraph 0364).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7, 9-11, 18-21, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burnett (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087408, in view of Lawrence et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,780).

As to claims 7, 18, and 29, Burnett does not teach calculating maximum and minimum thresholds; and comparing the maximum and minimum thresholds to a ratio of the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting to determine if the associated preference weighting is overriding the associated technical weighting.

Lawrence et al. teaches autonomous citation indexing and literature browsing using citation context (See abstract), in which he teaches calculating maximum and minimum thresholds (See column 12, lines 49-67; column 13, lines 1-10; column 14, lines 35-48); and comparing the maximum and minimum thresholds to a ratio of the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting to determine if the associated preference weighting is overriding the associated technical weighting (See paragraphs 0352-0353).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Burnett, to include calculating maximum and minimum thresholds; and comparing the maximum and minimum thresholds to a ratio of the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting to determine if the associated preference weighting is overriding the associated technical weighting.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Burnett, by the teachings of

Lawrence et al. because calculating maximum and minimum thresholds; and comparing the maximum and minimum thresholds to a ratio of the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting to determine if the associated preference weighting is overriding the associated technical weighting would improve the method for finding relevant and important publications on the web (See Lawrence et al., column 1, lines 61-66).

As to claims 9, 19, and 30, Burnett as modified, teaches adjusting or reducing the weighted summation value associated with the at least one offered service if the ratio of the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting violates the maximum threshold or the minimum threshold (See Lawrence et al., column 12, lines 49-67; column 13, lines 1-10; column 14, lines 35-48).

As to claims 10, 20, and 31, Burnett as modified, teaches discarding the at least one offered service if the ratio of the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting violates the maximum threshold or the minimum threshold (See Lawrence et al., column 12, lines 49-67; column 13, lines 1-10; column 14, lines 35-48).

As to claims 11 and 21, Burnett as modified, if the at least one offered service includes a bundle of two or more services calculating a comparison value for the at least one offered service by adjusting the weighted value associated

with the at least one offered service (See Burnett, paragraph 00015; paragraph 00017; paragraph 0162; paragraph 00353; paragraph 0364; also see Lawrence et al., column 12, lines 49-67; column 13, lines 1-10; column 14, lines 35-48).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on October 30, 2007, with respect to the rejected claims 1-3, 7, 9-15, 18-22, and 24-33 have been fully considered but they are not found to be persuasive:

In response to applicants' arguments regarding ***"none of the recited portions of Burnett teach or suggest obtaining a keyword from the information in the database resulting from searching the database, as expressly recited in claim 1"***, the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because Burnett discloses obtaining search result with a "Keyword" (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019). The claim language needs to be further amended because the claim language states that a user input is used to match information in the database and therefore because Burnett allows a user to input a keyword and obtain results from the database which contain that keyword then it reads on claim 1. Furthermore, Fig.4 shows that an initial search has been preformed and a list of identifiers/keywords has been obtained based on that search, which reads on the present application. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicants' arguments regarding "***Burnett at [0015] does not teach 'obtaining at least one keyword from the information in the database resulting from searching the database,' as recited in claim 1***", the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because paragraph 15 discloses a keyword used to search several databases through a search engine and obtaining results containing the keyword and a brief synopsis and therefore, does teach obtaining one keyword from the initial search. Burnett discloses obtaining search result with a "Keyword" (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019). The claim language needs to be further amended because the claim language states that a user input is used to match information in the database and therefore because Burnett allows a user to input a keyword and obtain results from the database which contain that keyword then it reads on claim 1. Furthermore, Fig.4 shows that an initial search has been preformed and a list of identifiers/keywords has been obtained based on that search, which reads on the present application. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicants' arguments regarding "***Burnett at [0016] does not teach 'obtaining at least one keyword from the information in the database resulting from searching the database,' as recited in claim 1***," the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because paragraph 16 discloses a keyword used to search several databases through a search engine and obtaining results containing the keyword and a brief

synopsis and therefore, does teach obtaining one keyword from the initial search. Burnett discloses obtaining search result with a "Keyword" (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019). The claim language needs to be further amended because the claim language states that a user input is used to match information in the database and therefore because Burnett allows a user to input a keyword and obtain results from the database which contain that keyword then it reads on claim 1. Furthermore, Fig.4 shows that an initial search has been preformed and a list of identifiers/keywords has been obtained based on that search, which reads on the present application. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicants' arguments regarding "***Claim 1 further recites, inter alia, "determining a weighted value associated with the at least one offered service based on the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting."*** The Office Action relies on Burnett at [0015]-[0017], [0019], [0162], [0352]-[0353], and [0364]. Burnett at [0015]-[0017], [0019], [0352]-[0353], and [0364] were described above. Burnett at [0162] discloses that "[t]he ranking of each of the database records in the Results List can be controlled by the user selecting an attribute and then specifying ascending or descending order." Nothing in the recited portions of Burnett teaches or suggests an offered service associated with "a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one offered service" or "a preference weighting indicating a provider

preference of the at least one offered service," the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because Burnett discloses words that have identifiers and that are weighted and determined to be outputted to the user in a prioritized manner (See paragraphs 0352-0353). Furthermore, the claim language as written does not disclose or define technical relevance or preference weighting therefore the examiner is making the broadest reasonable interpretation of their meaning. Burnett discloses ranking results by criteria (technical weighting) (paragraphs 0015-0017) and a user being able to select "advanced options" as part of their search (preference weighting) (See paragraphs 0353-0355; paragraph 0364), which the examiner believes to be a reasonable interpretation. USPTO personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim should not be read into the claim. *E-Pass Techs., Inc. V. 3Com Corp.*, 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003)

In response to applicants' arguments regarding, "***Burnett does not teach or suggest 'logic configured to obtain at least one keyword resulting from the search,' as recited in claim 13,***" the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because first it is unclear what is meant by "logic" because all computer use programs and logic to obtain information, therefore it is inherent. Second Burnett discloses obtaining search result with a "Keyword" (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019). The claim language

needs to be further amended because the claim language states that a user input is used to match information in the database and therefore because Burnett allows a user to input a keyword and obtain results from the database which contain that keyword then it reads on claim 1. Furthermore, Fig.4 shows that an initial search has been preformed and a list of identifiers/keywords has been obtained based on that search, which reads on the present application. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicants' arguments regarding ***"the recited portions of Burnett provide no teaching whatsoever of an offered service associated with "a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one offered" or "a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one offered service." As such, the recited portions of Burnett do not teach or suggest "logic configured to determine at least one offered service associated with the at least one keyword, the at least one offered service associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one offered service and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one offered service," as recited in claim 13,***" the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because Burnett discloses words that have identifiers and that are weighted and determined to be outputted to the user in a prioritized manner (See paragraphs 0352-0353). Furthermore, the claim language as written does

not disclose or define technical relevance or preference weighting therefore the examiner is making the broadest reasonable interpretation of their meaning.

Burnett discloses ranking results by criteria (technical weighting) (paragraphs 0015-0017) and a user being able to select “advanced options” as part of their search (preference weighting) (See paragraphs 0353-0355; paragraph 0364), which the examiner believes to be a reasonable interpretation. USPTO personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim should not be read into the claim. *E-Pass Techs., Inc. V. 3Com Corp.*, 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003)

In response to applicants’ arguments regarding ***“Burnett does not teach or suggest ‘logic configured to determine a weighted value associated with the at least one offered service based on the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting, as recited in claim 13,’***

the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because first it is unclear what is meant by “logic” because all computer use programs and logic to obtain information, therefore it is inherent. Second Burnett discloses words that have identifiers and that are weighted and determined to be outputted to the user in a prioritized manner (See paragraphs 0352-0353).

Furthermore, the claim language as written does not disclose or define technical relevance or preference weighting therefore the examiner is making the broadest reasonable interpretation of their meaning. Burnett discloses ranking results by

criteria (technical weighting) (paragraphs 0015-0017) and a user being able to select "advanced options" as part of their search (preference weighting) (See paragraphs 0353-0355; paragraph 0364), which the examiner believes to be a reasonable interpretation.

In response to applicants' arguments regarding ***"while Burnett discloses that the commodity products may be determined as a result of a search, Burnett does not teach that those products are used by a service suggestion analyzer configured to "determine at least one offered service associated with the" products, among other recitations of claim 24,"*** the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because "suggestion analyzer" is not defined within the claim language and therefore the examiner is making the broadest interpretation. Second Burnett discloses obtaining search result with a "Keyword" (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019). The claim language needs to be further amended because the claim language states that a user input is used to match information in the database and therefore because Burnett allows a user to input a keyword and obtain results from the database which contain that keyword then it reads on claim 1. Furthermore, Fig.4 shows that an initial search has been preformed and a list of identifiers/keywords has been obtained based on that search, which reads on the present application. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicants' arguments regarding ***"Nothing in the recited portions of Burnett teach or suggest an offered service that is associated with "a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one offered service" or "a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one offered service," as recited in claim 24,"*** the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because Burnett discloses words that have identifiers and that are weighted and determined to be outputted to the user in a prioritized manner (See paragraphs 0352-0353). Furthermore, the claim language as written does not disclose or define technical relevance or preference weighting therefore the examiner is making the broadest reasonable interpretation of their meaning. Burnett discloses ranking results by criteria (technical weighting) (paragraphs 0015-0017) and a user being able to select "advanced options" as part of their search (preference weighting) (See paragraphs 0353-0355; paragraph 0364), which the examiner believes to be a reasonable interpretation. USPTO personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim should not be read into the claim. *E-Pass Techs., Inc. V. 3Com Corp.*, 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003)

In response to applicants' arguments regarding ***"Burnett does not teach or suggest the claimed "technical weighting" or "preference weighting," it follows that Burnett does not teach or suggest "determine a weighted value***

associated with the at least one offered service based on the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting," as recited in claim 24," the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because Burnett discloses words that have identifiers and that are weighted and determined to be outputted to the user in a prioritized manner (See paragraphs 0352-0353). Furthermore, the claim language as written does not disclose or define technical relevance or preference weighting therefore the examiner is making the broadest reasonable interpretation of their meaning. Burnett discloses ranking results by criteria (technical weighting) (paragraphs 0015-0017) and a user being able to select "advanced options" as part of their search (preference weighting) (See paragraphs 0353-0355; paragraph 0364), which the examiner believes to be a reasonable interpretation. USPTO personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim should not be read into the claim. *E-Pass Techs., Inc. V. 3Com Corp.*, 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003)

In response to applicants' arguments regarding ***"Lawrence also cannot teach or suggest "obtaining at least one keyword from the information in the database resulting from searching the database,"*** the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because the examiner discloses that Burnett teaches obtaining a keyword from an initial search and therefore the argument is moot. Burnett discloses obtaining search result with a

“Keyword” (See paragraphs 0015-0017; paragraph 0019). The claim language needs to be further amended because the claim language states that a user input is used to match information in the database and therefore because Burnett allows a user to input a keyword and obtain results from the database which contain that keyword then it reads on claim 1. Furthermore, Fig.4 shows that an initial search has been preformed and a list of identifiers/keywords has been obtained based on that search, which reads on the present application.

Conclusion


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mellissa M. Chojnacki whose telephone number is (571) 272-4076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

January 7, 2009
MMC

/Charles Rones/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164

<div>Application Number</div> <div></div>	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination	
	10/611,630	AARON, JEFFREY A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mellissa M. Chojnacki	2164	